

Committee on Educational Policy and Planning

September 10, 2002      Meeting #1

CEPP members present: John Brueggemann (secretary), Pat Fehling (Chair), Chuck Joseph, Andy Kirshenbaum, Pat Oles, Amelia Rauser, Paty Rubio, Gordon Thompson, Hugh Foley

PF began the meeting with introductions and an agenda for the day. Our regular meetings are to be held on Tuesdays, 11:15-12:15, in the Intercultural Center. PF noted the protocols for taking minutes, which include the following. Elected faculty members on the committee (with the exception of the Chair) will take turns in alphabetical order keeping minutes. The minutes are to be archived at the CEPP website. For the time being, however, the website is being reorganized. So, we will forward our minutes to that archive later on once things are in order. For now, we should share preliminary drafts of minutes with "cepp-list" plus Andy Kirshenbaum (who is the temporary student representative until permanent reps are identified). PF suggested we do as much as we can to get minutes reviewed and revised before the next meeting so as to cut down on busy work during our brief time together.

We then turned our attention to the membership of CEPP. Ray Rodriques, the new Director of Assessment, has requested that he be allowed to visit CEPP meetings. We discussed the appropriateness of this in the meeting and in a subsequent email exchange. The consensus is that Ray be invited to visit with a clear understanding of his role and "non-voting" status. CJ suggested that in addition to contributing to our work on assessment, Ray could gain a broader institutional perspective by being a part of CEPP conversations.

PF also suggested we make some time for the elected faculty members to discuss the membership and function of CEPP. In response, PO raised concerns about the marginalization of administrators (e.g., Student Affairs). He also expressed his personal frustration with the way the faculty status of many administrators is regularly overlooked. JB suggested that the perception that faculty leadership has been insufficiently coherent and that some committees have been dominated by administrators warrant some special time set aside for discussion among elected faculty members.

CJ then led a wide-ranging discussion on the role of CEPP in shaping educational policy and working with Academic Affairs. He requested permission to consult with CEPP in developing policy, to which other committee members responded favorably. Most importantly, he suggested, we need to develop an academic vision for the college.

PF then reviewed a number of items that may comprise our agenda for the year. These include in no particular order the following: distance learning, assessment of the core curriculum, academic vision, and LS1. PO suggested consideration of two additional items, developing linkages between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs related to co-curricular activities, or more importantly cultivating ownership among faculty in that partnership; and developing a stronger advising system.

PF suggested each CEPP member review and rank these items in order of importance. CJ indicated he would send out a message with some specific possibilities linked to academic vision that might inform such prioritizing.

Respectfully submitted,

John Brueggemann